

**KENTUCKY BOARD OF EDUCATION
ANNUAL RETREAT
MAY 10-11, 2006**

**NATURAL BRIDGE STATE PARK
SLADE, KENTUCKY**

SUMMARY MINUTES

The Kentucky Board of Education held its annual retreat meeting on May 10-11, 2006, at Natural Bridge State Park in Slade, Kentucky. The Board conducted the following business:

Wednesday, May 10, 2006

CALL TO ORDER

Chair Keith Travis called the meeting to order at 9:10 a.m. He asked Judge William Trude to swear-in the recently appointed members.

SWEARING-IN OF BOARD MEMBERS

Judge William Trude administered the oath of office to C.B. Akins, Kaye Baird, Joe Brothers, Jeanne Ferguson, Judy Gibbons, Doug Hubbard and Keith Travis.

ROLL CALL

Present for the meeting were C.B. Akins, Kaye Baird, Joe Brothers, Jeanne Ferguson, Bonnie Lash Freeman, Judy Gibbons, Doug Hubbard, David Rhodes, Keith Travis, Janna Vice and David Webb. Absent was Tom Layzell.

REFLECTION ON GOVERNOR FLETCHER'S VISION FOR EDUCATION

Chair Travis and Commissioner Wilhoit welcomed the Board to the annual retreat meeting. They asked the members to reflect on themes they heard in their meeting with Governor Fletcher last night. The following themes were raised:

- A sense of urgency
- Early childhood and reading
- Opportunity for the Board to use the bully pulpit to have influence in the Commonwealth
- Keep moving in a forward, progressive direction
- Continue to foster positive relationships and working together
- Foreign language and high school reform
- Communicate
- Dealing with low-performing schools
- Getting out into the local communities and carrying our message

- Literacy and pushing the envelope where needed
- Provide leadership and not micromanage
- Decide where we can make the most difference

TEAMBUILDING ACTIVITY

At this point Robin Morley conducted a teambuilding activity to enhance the Board members' getting to know one another. They paired up and interviewed each other and then reported out what they had learned.

EDUCATION GOVERNANCE AND THE REGULATION PROCESS

Deputy Commissioner Kevin Noland conducted a presentation on education governance and the regulation process. He stated that he wanted to help the Board members understand how the Kentucky Board of Education fits into education governance. Noland divided the levels of governance into Federal, State and Local Governments. Under the Federal Government, he mentioned the President, Congress and the United States Department of Education. Under the state level, he noted that this is where the Board resides and he pointed out the following entities:

- Kentucky Constitution - provides for the General Assembly to create an efficient system of common schools.
- General Assembly - sets up the rest of the education system through state statutes. Also sets up committees to consider issues (Interim Joint Committee on Education, Education Assessment and Accountability Review Subcommittee and the Administrative Regulation Review Subcommittee) in the interim.
- Governor - uses the bully pulpit to raise issues and promotes ideas through the budget. Makes appointments to committees and boards.
- Secretary of Education - is over various education agencies and coordinates issues among them.
- Kentucky Board of Education - collaborates regularly with several advisory groups to improve the final product approved by the Board. Advisory groups include the Local Superintendents Advisory Council, National Technical Advisory Panel on Assessment and Accountability and School Curriculum, Assessment and Accountability Council.
- Commissioner of Education - hired by the Board and employed through contract. Has several advisory groups that will provide additional input for the Board. Role is to administer the Kentucky Department of Education and administer the policy set by the Board.
- Kentucky High School Athletic Association - oversees high school athletics on behalf of the Board.
- Office of Education Accountability - is under the legislative branch and is the entity designated to monitor public education.

Noland then moved to the local level where he mentioned local boards of education, school district superintendent, school principal and the school council. He then briefly covered the administrative regulation process and clarified that the bills passed by the

General Assembly will provide the skeleton on which the Board must build the specifics through regulations. Noland emphasized that approving a regulation is the only way the Board has to pass something that is legally enforceable. He noted that the process is set up by the General Assembly and stated that he must file regulations passed by the Board by the 15th of the month. Then, he said that a public hearing must be held and it must go through the appropriate legislative committees for review before becoming final. Noland commented that it can take from six to eight months for the regulatory process to be completed.

LEGISLATIVE PERSPECTIVE ON FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED IN THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE KBE'S PRIORITIES FOR 2006-07

Senator Ken Winters and Representative Frank Rasche, Co-Chairs of the Interim Joint Committee on Education, were present to share their advice to the Board from a legislative viewpoint. Issues discussed during this portion of the meeting included:

- Differentiated compensation
- Getting highly skilled individuals to choose teaching as a career
- Funding of kindergarten
- Facilities
- School choice and charter schools
- High school change
- Relationships among school districts
- Seamlessness of K-12 with higher education
- Teacher preparation
- Universities assuming a greater role in preparing teachers and not graduating them if not adequately prepared
- Communicate that teachers must adjust their teaching to maximize the additional time given to them for instruction
- Computers used to improve instruction
- Tremendous professional development needed for implementing online testing and focusing the use of computers on improved instruction
- Cost of health care

ROLE OF A STATE BOARD AS A POLICYMAKING BODY

Eric Schmall from the Center for Non-Profit Excellence conducted a session for the Board on the role of a state board relative to policymaking. Points made by Mr. Schmall included:

- Most of the time a group makes a better decision than an individual if: a) "All of us are smarter than one of us", b) Diversity exists in the group, and c) A degree of independence exists.
- The board is in charge of governance, not management. Governance consists of the vision, oversight and inspiration. Management includes planning and budgeting, organization of the work and staff and exerting control and solving problems.
- Leadership is coping with change and management is coping with complexity.

- The work of the board determines direction, speaks with one voice and does not direct staff (other than the CEO).
- The work of management is to execute the plan, focus operations, implement the work with a detailed focus and monitor the implementation.
- The plan is part of management but comes from the vision, which is set by the board. The plan must be reviewed periodically and adjusted to ensure it will achieve the vision.
- The board envisions the future through its vision and mission statements.
- A vision is a compelling, attainable picture or image of what can be achieved in the future and is converted into actions and plans that are implemented. It is lost if not regularly communicated.
- The board needs to work as a team through cohesion, communication, clarity of roles and identity and flexibility.
- To work as a team, trust, communication, leadership and emotional intelligence must be present.
- "Service which is rendered without joy helps neither the servant nor the served. But all other pleasures and possessions pale into nothingness before service that is rendered in the spirit of joy."

PANEL OF EXPERIENCED BOARD MEMBERS ON THE MOST IMPORTANT THINGS FOR NEW MEMBERS TO KNOW AND RESPONSE TO QUESTIONS FROM NEW MEMBERS

Janna Vice began the panel presentation and shared the following tips for how to prepare for Board meetings:

- The number one priority for a meeting is to come prepared.
- Begin preparation by reviewing the agenda and looking for front-burner issues.
- Call the designated staff on the staff notes on issues for which you need clarification.
- Review the background, statute and staff's recommendation in each staff note and formulate questions that you have.
- Determine if the item is in the review stage or up for final action. Time needs to be spent on items in the review stage in order to give staff the input necessary to revise it before it comes back to the Board for final action.
- Look at what the advisory groups listed in the staff notes had to say about the issue.
- Come to the meeting with the mindset of being open to discussion and work with the other members toward the best solution.

Next, David Webb talked about how to seek advice and inform oneself for the discussion as follows:

- Seek out plenty of advice by developing sources that one can trust.
- Education cooperative meetings are an excellent source of feedback.
- Stay in contact with students and parents.
- Be sure to listen to the tapes of the calls with committee chairs prior to the meeting.

- Keep in mind that the Board has a very broad constituency.

Bonnie Lash Freeman covered how to gather data and shared the following:

- Call teachers who are friends to advise you on issues.
- Seek out individuals at different levels to provide you with advice.
- Consider attending the National Association of State Boards of Education's New Board Member Institute to give oneself a national perspective.
- Look at information from state parent groups, such as the PTA and Commonwealth Institute for Parent Leadership.
- Consider how data on state agency children, special education students, and the achievement gap relate to issues.
- Consider what international/national standards recommend.
- Go on site visits to schools.
- Avail oneself of conference opportunities.

The last panelist was David Rhodes, who addressed Board etiquette as follows:

- Keep in mind that the meetings need to be orderly and members must be considerate of one another in order for a state policy board to cover the amount of issues that must be discussed at each meeting. Taking turns and following the chair's lead helps meetings be more productive. (Generally, Robert's Rules of Order are observed except that since our board is small, we generally follow the more relaxed format found on page 158.)
- If we disagree on issues that are being discussed at a board meeting, we need to do so in a respectful manner.
- Remember that the meetings are public and are web cast; thus, members should use appropriate language that is acceptable to all ages.
- Everyone needs to take the opportunity to express his/her opinion on topics but needs to be as concise as possible. Be aware that there are ten other members who may want to speak. Please be courteous to your fellow members and avoid over-domination of the discussion time.
- As we are currently operating, the board has two standing committees: Curriculum, Instruction and Assessment and Management. The committees meet one at a time at each meeting in order to give those members not on a committee the opportunity to sit in the audience and listen to the discussion. If you are not a member of a committee that is meeting but are in the audience, please give the committee chair any issues pertaining to the committee's agenda you want discussed in the committee meeting ahead of time. In order to avoid excessive disruptions and prolonged meetings, we do not recognize speakers from the audience unless they request to speak in advance and permission is granted by the board chair and/or committee chair.
- To facilitate effective and efficient board meetings, members are encouraged to contact the staff members listed on the individual staff notes in the agenda book to seek clarification prior to the meetings. However, if members have specific concerns or questions on the opinion of staff, the commissioner should be contacted.

- Unless authorized by the full board or a committee of the board, work assignments to Department staff should not to be made by individual board members.
- Issues and information imparted in a closed session of the board on personnel or litigation are deemed confidential and are not to be shared with any persons outside of the board.

Thursday, May 11, 2006

REVIEW OF KBE BELIEFS, MISSION, VISION AND STRATEGIC PLAN GOALS AND DISCUSSION OF UPCOMING AGENDA ITEMS

Commissioner Wilhoit indicated that he would like to begin the discussion with Eric Schmall's concept of vision and think about what a successful 25 year-old would be like. He noted that Tab 3 in the Board's handbook contains the existing strategic plan and commented that the vision within this plan seems to be hidden. Wilhoit suggested that in the revised document that the vision be more visible. After the vision, the commissioner suggested that the members look at whether the eleven questions he would be proposing as areas of focus are the right ones to ask. The members agreed to proceed in this manner.

To introduce the kind of thinking he was having about vision, Commissioner Wilhoit handed out a statement by former Kentucky Governor Ned Breathitt that read: "Ours is a vision and ours is a growing reality of a great society in which the accidents of race and color, parentage and poverty, location and geography shall not be allowed to dim the light of human hope and cripple the possibilities of human growth." He characterized this as a vision focused on taking away the impediments to learning. Wilhoit went on to share a statement from the Supreme Court case, *Rose v. Council for Better Education* (1989), that read: "The children of the poor and the children of the rich, the children who live in the poor districts and the children who live in the rich districts must be given the same opportunity and access to an adequate education. This obligation cannot be shifted to the local counties and local school districts." He said that these statements provide a context to the role the Board should play.

Comments from Board members relative to vision included:

- The vision statement needs to be concise so that everyone can articulate it.
- We need to communicate that results matter.
- Proficiency by 2014 is too narrow a statement for the vision.
- We need to get to proficiency as soon as possible.
- Low-performing schools need to be considered.

Next, the commissioner moved on to pose questions in eleven areas to see if the Board members agreed these should be areas of focus in its plan and part of a comprehensive state policy. The first one was "Provide Adequate and Equitable Resources", under which the following was listed:

- Background Information

- ❑ SEEK established to assure equity and adequacy for each and every child
 - ❑ Resulted from Rose v. Council for Better Education
 - ❑ SEEK provides guaranteed base plus state funds for student needs
 - ❑ Tier I - Additional local option equalized
 - ❑ Tier II - Local cap
- Issues for KBE
 - ❑ Advocacy for adequacy of funds
 - ❑ Active court case
 - ❑ Strategic choices
 - ❑ Time on task
 - ❑ Differentiated compensation
 - ❑ Transportation/facilities

Commissioner Wilhoit asked if the Board wants to wrestle with this question. He indicated that the Department did one of the studies on adequacy that went to the legislature along with proposed increases that were funded this time.

Keith Travis noted that the challenge is how to put children into the education pipeline and have them all come out as productive citizens.

Jeanne Ferguson felt that the Board has a moral obligation to do all it can for children but said this body cannot replace everything in a student's life.

Chair Travis continued that the question is how to solve everyone's needs.

Doug Hubbard then stated that the Board may need to be ready to address the question of adequacy in the event that the people who filed the suit on adequacy win.

C.B. Akins thought that layers of adequacy exist (state, among districts, among schools, etc.).

David Rhodes felt that this Board may need to be more aggressive in using the bully pulpit on critical issues than in the past.

Keith Travis then pointed out that the Board's job is to set the vision, give the tools to get the job done and measure progress. He noted that it is not to drill down into the details.

The next potential area of focus introduced by the commissioner was "Set World-Class Student Learning Standards", under which the following was cited:

- Background Information
 - ❑ From input measures to performance results
 - ❑ Standards-based movement, content and performance
 - ❑ Academic expectations, Program of Studies, Core Content
 - ❑ Standards setting in Kentucky

- Issues for KBE
 - ❑ Teacher understanding – content and depth of knowledge
 - ❑ Breadth and depth of standards
 - ❑ Constant review/updating

Commissioner Wilhoit noted that last year, the Board redefined the Academic Expectations, Core Content and Program of Studies. He emphasized that very rigorous standards have been set out. Wilhoit was concerned that teachers understand these redefined documents and can use them to improve instruction. He also indicated it will be necessary to set up a continuous cycle of review for each content area. The commissioner noted it to be the responsibility of the Board to denote what students should know and be able to do.

C.B. Akins pointed out that students with disabilities must be considered within this discussion.

The commissioner agreed and stated that the challenge is how to hold on to high standards and meet these students' unique needs.

The next potential area of focus was "Align Graduation Requirements with Higher Education and Workforce Expectations", under which the following was cited:

- Background Information
 - ❑ Two different systems (P-16/higher education)
 - ❑ Marginalizing career and technical education
 - ❑ Remediation numbers too high
 - ❑ All one system
 - ❑ Kentucky's new graduation requirements
- Issues for KBE
 - ❑ Quality Implementation
 - ❑ Using requirements to align systems
 - ❑ Continue to benchmark
 - ❑ Unfinished agenda – world languages, health, arts, technology
 - ❑ Supporting special needs students

Commissioner Wilhoit commented that better communication must occur with higher education and with employers to get the systems in sync with one another. He stated that there is potential of a joint meeting with the Council on Postsecondary Education in the fall.

At this point Janna Vice and Jeanne Ferguson expressed that the amount of materials in the Program of Studies may not be realistic for teachers to handle. They felt that there was no prioritization indicating levels of importance.

Commissioner Wilhoit replied that power standards were designated within the revised Program of Studies but agreed that the breath/depth discussion should be continued.

When the Program of Studies is revised the next time, he said, it will be done one content area at a time, with mathematics being first, so that it is not such a massive task.

The Board moved on to consider the area of "Hold Educators Accountable for Student Success", under which the following was cited:

- Background Information
 - ❑ System to hold schools accountable
 - ❑ Continuous progress toward high standards
 - ❑ From NRT to KIRIS to CATS
 - ❑ NCLB changes
 - ❑ Seven Steps Forward
 - ❑ New Contract (2+2+2)
- Issues for KBE
 - ❑ 2007 transition year
 - ❑ ACT
 - ❑ Revise accountability system
 - ❑ Enhance writing process
 - ❑ Move to on-line
 - ❑ Role of end-of-course exams
 - ❑ Balancing high stakes with formative/diagnostic

Commissioner Wilhoit stated that he would send the Board information on his Seven Steps Forward in Assessment to give them background on how we got to where we currently are for the new assessment system, 2007 and beyond. He shared that one issue the Board will soon face is whether it wants to make changes to the accountability system.

Joe Brothers felt that we do not need to forget about the role of the current accountability system and also on how teachers and principals are evaluated.

Chair Travis added that the Board may need to look at the current evaluation system due to the number of educators that are rated above average.

One more area of potential focus was "Ensure Students Assume Responsibility for Their Learning", which included the following:

- Background Information
 - ❑ Missing accountability element – students
 - ❑ Teacher concerns
 - ❑ Local options
 - ❑ Longitudinal data - Education Assessment and Accountability Review Subcommittee (EAARS)
- Issues for KBE
 - ❑ Math and reading, 3-8
 - ❑ Factor into accountability

The commissioner noted that we must do both school and student accountability. For the first time with the new testing system, he stated, the ability to look at the testing program over time and have an element of student accountability at the student level through released items will exist. A multi-dimensional system will need to emerge to hold students, teachers and leaders responsible for learning.

Another potential element of for the Board's focus was "Build P-16 Longitudinal Data Systems", which included:

- Background Information
 - ❑ Individual collection of data by hand
 - ❑ Early technology – SIS/finance/teacher data
 - ❑ School capacity building
 - ✓ MAX
 - ✓ NCES alignment
 - ✓ Individual student identifier
 - ✓ Federal grant
- Issues for KBE
 - ❑ Major implementation phase
 - ❑ Revise KETS plans
 - ❑ Retrofit school workstations
 - ❑ Alignment with other systems
 - ❑ SIF/SIS

Commissioner Wilhoit indicated that the data system will allow us to have sufficient information to answer the critical education questions that exists. He explained the Department has put individual student identifiers in place and is about to issue a Request for Proposal for a new student information system. Wilhoit went on to say that higher education is doing similar activities relative to data that will eventually align with our system. He emphasized that data is power and is a valuable policy tool.

The next potential focus area was "Provide Guidance and Support to Districts and Schools", under which the following was included:

- Background Information
 - ❑ “We define, you do” phase
 - ❑ Local differences emerge
 - ❑ Early childhood guidance
 - ❑ Math initiative
 - ❑ High school redesign
 - ❑ Cross-agency work
- Issues for KBE
 - ❑ Instructional resources
 - ❑ Model course outlines
 - ❑ Standards-based units of study
 - ❑ Student work and rubrics
 - ❑ LEP/special needs students

- ❑ High school/middle school alliance

The commissioner explained that in some places, the expertise does not exist to improve instruction and performance dramatically. He said that we will have to give specific assistance in those places but cautioned the key is to guide the implementation but not direct it.

Moving on, the next area submitted for consideration was "Ensure Capacity to Teach and Lead", which included the following:

- Background Information
 - ❑ SBDM support
 - ❑ Standards and Indicators of School Improvement
 - ❑ New Superintendents' Testing and Training
 - ❑ Early Statewide Training Programs
 - ❑ SAELP Leadership Programs
 - ❑ CEO Network
- Issues for KBE
 - ❑ Compensation to levels of surrounding states
 - ❑ Recruitment efforts
 - ❑ Leadership development
 - ❑ Cooperation at EPSB and universities
 - ❑ Cabinet and P-16 agendas

Commissioner Wilhoit said that this area points again to the need to coordinate with higher education. He felt that everyone must accept responsibility for improving learning.

The next area under consideration was "Monitor and Report Results", which included:

- Background Information
 - ❑ Academic reporting
 - ❑ Graduation rates/dropouts
 - ❑ Growth charts
 - ❑ College enrollment/remediation
 - ❑ Report cards
- Issues for KBE
 - ❑ Explore/Plan/ACT
 - ❑ Surveys of customers
 - ❑ Productivity/efficiency
 - ❑ Expanded reporting

The commissioner asked the Board to think about what the Board's responsibility in this area should be. He thought it might be the publishing of reports to put light on issues.

Still another area under consideration was "Reward Success", which included:

- Background Information
 - ❑ Financial rewards for success
 - ❑ Consolidated planning
 - ❑ Recognition/status and growth
- Issues for KBE
 - ❑ 2014 achievement goal
 - Growth recognition

Commissioner Wilhoit indicated that other methods of rewards besides dollars must be found.

The last area of potential focus for the Board was "Support and Turn Around Low-Performing Schools and Districts", which included:

- Background Information
 - ❑ Commonwealth School Improvement Funds
 - ❑ Distinguished Educators/Highly Skilled Educators
 - ❑ Tiered assistance
 - ❑ NCLB influence
- Issues for KBE
 - ❑ Voluntary Assistance
 - ❑ Engagement of community
 - ❑ Most-troubled schools strategy
 - ❑ Choice

The commissioner said that dealing with these schools will soon have to be faced by the Board.

Due to time constraints, the commissioner indicated he would take the feedback from today's discussion and craft a document for the Board's review and comment prior to the June meeting that would frame a vision and areas of focus.

REVIEW OF MEETING DATES FOR 2006 AND 2007 AND CONSIDERATION OF MEETING DATES FOR 2008

Mary Ann Miller was asked to come back to the June meeting with a proposal on dates that would:

- ❑ Cancel the July 5, 2006 meeting
- ❑ Reflect the retreat and three other meetings out in the state

BOARD COMMITTEES/OPERATIONS/PROCEDURES

Chair Travis asked all members to review the list of committee and liaison assignments and let Mary Ann Miller know by the end of the month what their interests are in this area. C.B. Akins and Jeanne Ferguson went ahead and expressed interest in the

KSB/KSD Committee and C.B. Akins asked to be the liaison with the Equity Advisory Council.

REVIEW OF THE KBE POLICY MANUAL

Mary Ann Miller was asked to make the following revisions to the Policy Manual and bring it back for final approval in June:

- ❑ On page 4, line 1, change "shall" to "should".
- ❑ On page 4, line 4, change "Letter to the Editor" to "document for publication that is a board-related item".
- ❑ On page 4, line 6, change "letter" to "document".

BOARD MEMBER CONCERNS/QUESTIONS

David Rhodes expressed concern that the Board did not have a clear procedure for making motions. It was decided through a show of hands that in the future the motion and second would be made at the beginning of an item with the discussion and vote following.

ADJOURNMENT

The Board adjourned at 12:00 noon.